

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is being filed in compliance with the Rules requiring a Submission Accompanying Request for Continued Examination.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy accorded to their undersigned representative during a series of telephone conversations culminating in a telephone interview on 14 February 2005. During the course of these conversations the Examiner agreed to review Applicants' Amendment After Final Rejection and to thereafter discuss the same with Applicants' undersigned representative. That discussion took place on 14 February 2005, and as a result thereof it was agreed between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned representative that the foregoing amendment of Claim 24 of this application would overcome the Examiner's rejection of that claim under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims 24-35 were pending in this application as of the time of the issuance of the currently outstanding FINAL Official Action. Claims 1-23 were previously canceled. By the foregoing Amendment, only Claim 24 is amended. No claims are canceled and no claims are added. Accordingly, Claims 24-35 as hereinabove amended and reproduced with appropriate status identifiers constitute the claims under active prosecution in this application.

More specifically, in the currently outstanding Final Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d), and reconfirm that the required certified copies of the priority document have been received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office;
2. Indicated that the drawings filed on 14 June 2004 have been accepted; and

3. Finally rejected Claims 24-35 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Further comment in these Remarks regarding items 1-2 above is not considered to be necessary.

As indicated above, Claim 24 now has been amended in accordance with the agreement reached between the Examiner and the Applicants' undersigned representative. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's currently outstanding FINAL rejection of Claim 24 has been overcome by the foregoing Amendment.

Reconsideration of Claim 24 and the claims directly and/or indirectly dependent thereon in response to this Amendment, therefore, is respectfully requested.

In this regard as well, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's currently outstanding rejection of Claim 32 also should be withdrawn.

Despite the original disclosure of the changeability of the voltage of the signal-use power supply in original Claim 20 and at page 23, lines 3 to 17 of the present specification, the Examiner has maintained that the changeability of the voltage of the signal-use power supply between the first and second modes of operation discussed above with respect to Claim 24 is not adequately disclosed in the present specification so as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. In support of that position, the Examiner has discussed the first mode of operation in detail with reference to pages 32-34 of the specification and asserted that the first paragraph of page 49 shows only the changeability of the signal-use power supply based upon gray levels of the image, without specifically teaching the changeability of the voltage of the signal-use power supply between the first and second modes of operation claimed in Claim 24.

Applicants respectfully note, however, that the first paragraph of page 49 (to which Applicant has directed the Examiner's attention previously) cannot be read out of the context of the preceding two full paragraphs on page 48 that discuss the switching of the mode of operation of the claimed device between that of the first and second modes of operation as now set forth in Claim 24. Therefore, Applicants' respectfully submit that the final full paragraph on page 48 specifically indicates that the relationship between the write voltage and transmissivity in the mode of the present invention (i.e., the first mode as claimed) differs from that of the conventional image display sequence (i.e., the second mode as claimed), referencing Figs. 21, 22A and 22B as being illustrative of that difference. Consequently, Applicants also respectfully submit that the discussion in the first paragraph of page 49 with respect to adjusting write voltages by reference to the black display in the first mode as compared with the case where the second mode is adopted can only be construed as a disclosure that the voltage of the signal-use power supply is changeable between the first display mode (the mode of the present invention) and the second display mode (the conventional).

Consequently, Applicants respectfully requests that the presently outstanding FINAL rejections in this application be reconsidered in light of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, and that a decision allowing this application with Claims 24-35 as hereinabove amended be issued in response to this communication.

Applicant: K. Miyachi  
USSN: 09/595,363  
Page 10

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 22, 2005

Reg. No. 27,840

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Customer No. 21874

478708

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

David A. Tucker  
(type or print name of practitioner)  
Attorney for Applicant

Edwards & Angell, LLP  
P. O. Box 55874  
P.O. Address

Boston, MA 02205